

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIV.

APRIL, 1910.

No. 2.

THE VICAR OF CHRIST.

III.

Suppose Peter had been the "Prince" of the Apostles, did he have the power to give this lordship to his successor? And if he had the power, did he do so? Where is it written in the Bible? Where is it written in History?

1. The Emperors recognized no "Vicar of Christ."

Pope Leo X, in the Lateran Synod of 1516, said, "It is manifestly established that the Roman Pontiff for the time being, as having authority over all councils, has alone the full power of convoking, transferring, dissolving;" a claim made no earlier than 785 by Hadrian I. — This is manifestly untrue.

The Emperor Constantine called the First General Council at Nicaea, in Bithynia, in 325; the Emperor made the opening address; the Emperor presided for a time; the Emperor formally confirmed the acts of the council; some of the main sessions were held in the Emperor's palace; the ecclesiastical president was Bishop Hosius of Cordova, not the Roman Bishop Sylvester or his Legates.

The Second General Council, at Constantinople, in 381, was called by the Emperor Theodosius alone. The Pope was neither present nor represented. The Emperor alone confirmed the acts of the Council.

After the division of the Roman Empire, in 395, the Emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian III called the Third General Council, at Ephesus, in 431; the Emperor bade the

Bishops depart; the Emperor restored Cyril and Memnon; the Emperor ordered the writings of Nestorius burned.

The Emperors Valentinian and Marcian called the Fourth General Council to Chalcedon, in 451, and presided; the Emperor called the Council in spite of the protest of Pope Leo I; the Emperor confirmed the acts of the Council in 452.

The Emperor Justinian I called the Fifth General Council, to Constantinople, in 553. Though Pope Vigilius was in the city, he did not preside; he was censured.

The Emperor Constantius Pogonatus called the Sixth General Council, at Constantinople, in 680, which was held in a part of the Emperor's palace. The Emperor ordered what was to be done, what order was to be observed, who was to speak, who was to keep silence. The Council declared Pope Honorius a heretic.

The Empress Irene called the Seventh General Council, at Nicaea, in 787. The Patriarch Tarasius of Constantinople led the proceedings, together with Petronas and John, the imperial commissioners.

The Emperor Basilus called the Eighth General Council, at Constantinople, in 869. The last Councils were poorly attended by the Westerners.

According to history, the emperors were either blissfully ignorant of, or they calmly ignored, the "Vicar of Christ."

2. *The early liturgies know nothing of the "Vicar of Christ."*

Of seventeen liturgies from the various parts of the world none favors Peter's supremacy, the most of them are plainly and positively against the claim. The ancient liturgy of St. James, for instance, describes the "Holy Catholic Church" as "founded on the Rock of faith, that the gates of hell may not prevail against it." (Littledale, *Petrine Claims*, 60—69.)

The Roman Missal is of the very highest authority in the Roman Church. The collect for the Vigil of SS. Peter and Paul speaks of "the rock of the Apostolic Confession," and the Council of Trent speaks of the Faith "as the firm and only

foundation, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail." (Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 80. 81.)

Pope Urban III, in a letter of 1185, says the Church is "founded upon a rock which is based upon the solidity of the Faith, a foundation bestowed upon her in the strength of the Apostolic Confession."

Pope Celestine III, writing in 1196, says, "The *Truth* thus speaking of *Himself*, 'Upon this rock will I build my Church.'" (*Ang. Brief*, p. 24.)

3. *The early Church Fathers did not know that the Pope as Peter's successor was the "Vicar of Christ."*

Pope Clement, who died in 101, thinks Paul won the prize of honor and is the greatest model. (Schick, p. 51.)

St. Cyprian writes: "Assuredly, the rest of the Apostles were also the same as was Peter, endowed with a like partnership both of honor and power." (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 71.)

Ambrose of Milan, who died in 397, thinks Peter and Paul equal in rank of honor.

Origen writes: "If you think the whole Church built upon Peter alone, what will you say of John, the Son of Thunder, or each one of the Apostles? And are we to dare to say that the 'gates of hell' shall not prevail against Peter only, but that they shall prevail against the other Apostles and those who are perfect? Are not the words, 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it,' and 'Upon this rock will I build my Church,' said of *them all*, and of each single one of them?" (Oxenham, p. 30; *North Am. Rev.*, Dec., 1907, p. 587; Littledale, *P. C.*, 72.)

Jerome (*Ep.*, p. 146) writes: "If it is a question of authority, the world is greater than the city. Wherever there is a bishop, at Rome, or at Eugubium, or at Constantinople, or at Rhegium, or at Alexandria, or at Tanis, he has the same worth, the same priesthood. The power of wealth or the humility of poverty do not make a bishop higher or lower. They are all successors of the Apostles." (Gore, *R. C. C.*, p. 116; Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 70—90.)

4. If the emperors, and the liturgies, and the Fathers know of no Pope as the Vicar of Christ, *surely we can easily find him plainly in the Canons and Decrees of the Councils of the Church?* If anywhere, he ought certainly be found there.

The "Canons of the Apostles" know only the "first bishop" of each nation, who is to do naught without the consent of all. (34th Canon.)

The Council of Laodicea knows nothing higher or more central than the metropolitans.

The First General Council, of Nicaea, in 325, provides that the Patriarch of Alexandria should have the same authority over the churches of his province as the Pope of Rome over the churches of his province, the "suburbicarian" churches, *i. e.*, of Central and Southern Italy, with Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica.

The Council of Antioch, in 341, forbids appeals beyond the provincial synod under the metropolitan.

In 343 or 347 the *local* Council of Sardica granted to Julius the closely restricted right to order the hearing of certain appeals. This was rejected by the Eastern and African churches, and repealed by the ninth canon of the General Council of Chalcedon, which instituted a system of appeals, in which the name of the Roman See does not so much as appear. Even this canon, as a Sardican canon, has been pronounced spurious by the Roman theologian Aloysius Vincenzi in a book from the Vatican press, in 1875. (Littledale, *P. R.*, pp. 121. 238; *P. C.*, pp. 93—96.)

The Second General Council, that of Constantinople, in 381, virtually repealed the alleged Sardican Canons and enacted that the Bishop of Constantinople shall have precedence of honor next after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome; a civil and political reason, not a religious reason.

Of the nine Roman councils during the fourth century, the one in 386, under Siricius, forbids the consecration of a

bishop without the *knowledge* of the Roman patriarch; nothing is said as to his *consent*.

In the Council of Carthage, in 418, Faustinus, one of the Roman legates, asked that the right of appeal to Rome be allowed, since it was given by the Sardican Canons, which he alleged to be Canons of the Council of Nicaea. This was challenged, and the matter was to be verified. All appeals over sea were forbidden under pain of excommunication. They wrote Pope Boniface I that they would not tolerate his insolence in reinstating the deposed priest Apiarius. One of the signers was Augustine.

The Carthage Council, of 424, wrote Pope Celestine that the Sardican Canons were not Nicene Canons at all, and asked him to send no more legates, since they could settle their own affairs better than he.

The Third General Council, of Ephesus, in 431, disregarded the action of Pope Celestine deposing Nestorius of Constantinople, and asked this Archbishop to take his seat. He was deposed after proof of his guilt was furnished, not in virtue of the Pope's judgment. The Eighth Canon provides that no bishop shall invade any province which was not from the beginning under his jurisdiction, "lest the pride of power should creep in under the pretext of a sacred office, and thus we might unknowingly and gradually lose that freedom which Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior of all men, obtained for us with His precious blood, and bestowed upon us." Almost prophetic foresight! (*Our Brief*, p. 34.)

The Fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon, in 451, received the teaching of Pope Leo I of Rome; the orthodoxy was questioned; for five days it was examined; then 160 bishops publicly declared their acceptance of it, only because it agreed with St. Cyril's teaching, and with the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople. And even the Roman legate, Paschasinus, for himself and his colleagues, said thus, "It is clear that the faith of Pope Leo is the same as that of the Fathers of Nicaea and Constantinople, and that there is no

difference. That is the reason why the Pope's letter, which has restated this faith because of the heresy of Eutyches, has been received." (Littledale, *P. R.*, p. 239.)

The Fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon, in 451, said: "The Fathers with good reason bestowed precedence on the chair of Old Rome, because it was the imperial city." So it was not a divine institution, and it was for a political reason. Pope Leo I resisted this Canon, yet on the purely technical grounds of conflict with the sixth Nicene Canon, which gave the second place to Alexandria. (Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 99—106.) Leo admitted the orthodoxy of the Council. Had the supremacy of Peter been of divine origin, it would have been heresy to deny or ignore it, and the Council would not have been orthodox. (*Ang. Br.*, p. 43.) This precedence gave to Rome no jurisdiction over the other churches.

From the twelve Roman synods during the fifth century we learn that Bishop Hilary of Arles resisted the Bishop of Rome, never retracted, and yet is a saint and a Doctor of the Roman Church, and that Pope Gelasius, in 496, wrote: "It is the duty of pontiffs to obey the imperial ordinances in all things temporal."

The Synodus Palmaris of 76 bishops virtually tried Pope Symmachus, in 501, who had been accused of grave crimes before Theodoric the Ostrogoth.

During the sixth century many councils were held in Gaul and Spain, yet we find only one reference to the Pope, enjoining him to be prayed for at every mass. The Council of Lyons, in 567, did not accept the Canons of Sardica, on which the whole system of papal appeals is based, for there is no provision for appeal beyond the metropolitan.

The Fifth General Council, at Constantinople, in 553, did not even so much as read the letter of Pope Vigilius, and condemned the "Three Chapters," despite the Pope's advocacy, and struck his name from the diptychs, or registers, of the Church—a virtual act of excommunication.

The Sixth General Council, 681, judged "that Honorius,

formerly Pope of Old Rome, be anathematized" . . . "Honorius the heretic."

The Roman Synod, of 963, deposed Pope John XII for simony and adultery and other grievous crimes.

The Synod of Sutri, in 1046, condemned Pope Sylvester III as an impostor, degraded him from holy orders, imprisoned him for life, and compelled the abdication of Benedict IX and Gregory VI, one of whom must have been the lawful claimant.

The Council of Pisa, in 1409, excommunicated Popes Benedict XIII and Gregory XII as schismatics, heretics, and perjurers, and crowned Alexander V.

The Council of Constance, which met in 1415, deposed Pope John XXIII. The counts were so scandalous that they were not published with the sentence. He is described as "an obstinate heretic," "a notorious simoniac," and as "a devil incarnate."

The Council of Basel, in 1439, declared Pope Eugenius IV deposed, and elected Pope Felix V.

These depositions of Popes are a revolution turning the papal autocracy into a church parliament. If the "Vicar of Christ" is the Head of the Church, the Church frequently committed suicide, cutting off its own head. (Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 91—124.)

5. If the official Canons and Decrees of the Councils do not reveal any "Vicar of Christ," *perhaps other acts of Councils and Fathers and others will show that some such exalted personage existed.*

Pope Anicetus, 157—168, tried to *persuade* Polycarp to keep Easter always on a Sunday. Failing in this, he did not condemn the opposition as a piece of insubordination, but conceded to Polycarp to celebrate the Eucharist. In this discussion Polycarp cited the example of St. John and the other Apostles. Anicetus does not say a word about Peter, or any privilege of his own office, but alleges merely the custom of the "elders" who preceded himself. Xystus, Telesphorus, Hy-

ginus, and Pius, the predecessors of Anicetus, had also been in communion with the Asiatic Christians, though these did not keep Easter on a Sunday.

Bishop Victor I of Rome, 193—202, in a domineering manner excommunicated the Asiatic churches who held to the tradition of St. John and insisted on keeping Easter on the day of the Jewish passover, the 14th day of Nisan. A large Synod at Ephesus under Polycrates rejected the demands of Victor. (Schick, p. 61.) Irenaeus and other bishops rebuked Victor, and used expressions handling him very severely, and called the Roman Popes "presbyters," and ignored Victor's excommunication. Eusebius, in the fourth century, sees in Victor's action nothing but a piece of undue intolerance. (Pul-
ler, pp. 25—30.)

When Pope Victor, or his successor Zephyrinus, 202—219, allowed adulterers and fornicators to be restored to church fellowship after a light penance, Tertullian, deeply incensed in his moral earnestness, with bitter irony calls the Romish bishop by the name of his pagan colleague, Pontifex Maximus, and translates it into Episcopus Episcoporum, that is, one who sets himself up for an ecclesiastical despot. (Hase I, p. 218; Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 129. 130.)

Pope Callistus, 218—223, was accused by St. Hippolytus the martyr, Bishop of Portus (died about 250), of aiding heresy, of swindling depositors in a bank, of having been sentenced to scourging and to penal servitude in the mines, of having obtained church office by flattery, of being still a knave and an impostor, of having denied the Trinity, etc. He withdrew from Callistus and was consecrated as rival Pope of Rome, and yet met with no condemnation from the Church.

According to Doellinger's theory, in *Hippolytus and Callistus*, Christians in the third century, so far from regarding the Roman bishop as their master and teacher, troubled themselves very little to inquire who the bishop of Rome was.

Bishop Demetrius of Alexandria held two synods, 231 and 232, in which he deposed the celebrated Origen as pres-

byter and teacher, and excommunicated him, without saying a word to the Roman bishop. Later on Bishop Pontianus asked for the opinion of the Roman clergy, and they agreed with Demetrius. (Schick, p. 65.)

In 253 Bishop Fidus asked to have infant baptism forbidden. Sixty-six bishops met at Carthage and rejected the petition. And Cyprian, the Bishop of Carthage, was the president of the Synod, not the Bishop of Rome.

The Council of Carthage, in 255, rejected the letter of Pope Stephen, though enforced with a threat of excommunication, wherein he condemned the ruling of the Synod earlier in the year, insisting on the rebaptism of sectaries, while the Roman bishops admitted the validity of heretical baptisms.

The bishops of Leon and Merida, Basilides and Martial, sacrificed to idols, and Martial buried his child with heathen ceremonies; they confessed their sins and resigned; Bishop Stephen of Rome declared them still in office; the Spanish bishops appealed against this ruling to Bishop Cyprian of Carthage; thirty-seven bishops met there and reversed the sentence of Rome, in 270.

The main citations from Cyprian in favor of the Pope's supremacy are forgeries, as Beluze testifies. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 140.)

About the same time, Cyprian, presiding over eighty-seven bishops at a Council at Carthage, said: "No one of us sets himself up as Bishop of bishops or forces his colleagues to obedience by tyrannical terrorizing; for every Bishop in the free use of his liberty and power has his own right of judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he can himself judge another. But let us wait for the judgment of our universal Lord, Jesus Christ, who, singly and alone, has power to advance us in the government of His Church and to judge of our conduct." (*Our Brief*, p. 31; Puller, pp. 51—90.)

In Letter 74 Cyprian speaks of Pope Stephen's "error," his lies, his betrayal of the truth and faith, his haughtiness and ignorance.

St. Firmilian compares Stephen to Judas Iscariot, and censures his "audacity and insolence." "Thou art worse than all heretics." The bishops of Palestine write in the same strain. (Schick, p. 62.)

In this argument we have the first clear evidence of a Pope styling himself the successor of St. Peter, but yet no coupling with that of primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church as cause and effect.

When Pope Stephen, for the first time in recorded history, claims to be Peter's successor in Peter's own chair, St. Firmilian says of this boast, "I am justly indignant at such open and manifest folly in Stephen." (Puller, p. 84.)

When Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, was tried, in 264, St. Firmilian presided, the same whom Pope Stephen had excommunicated. That shows that no "Vicar of Christ" was recognized. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 141.)

Pope Pius II admitted that before the Nicene Council, in 325, very little regard was had to the Church of Rome. (E. G. Man, p. 104.)

In all the records preserved to us of the jealous suspicion with which the pagan State watched every detail of Christian usage, we find no trace of any "Vicar of Christ" ruling the Christians scattered in the wide Roman empire, such as the Jewish patriarch at Tiberias ruling all synagogues in the empire by his legates *a latere*.

The very existence of the Councils, parliaments of the Church, shows that there was no "Vicar of Christ" known to the people.

The Arian Council of Antioch, in 341, defied Pope Julius. He first claimed papal confirmation necessary to the reception of canons. Pope Innocent I, about sixty years later, rejected these canons, yet they were accepted *de facto*, and by the Council of Chalcedon *de jure*, and embodied in the code of the Roman Church itself. So, then, papal confirmation is not necessary to the reception of canons.

When Pope Julius I, 336—352, reproved some Eastern

bishops for calling a synod at Antioch without his permission, they laughed and told him Christianity arose in the East, and if there were any question of superiority, such belonged to the elder, Oriental, rather than to the younger, Western, branch. (Schick, p. 67.)

In 357 Pope Liberius signed the Arian creed of the Third Council of Sirmium, and Hilary of Poitiers writes, "Anathema to thee, renegade Liberius!"

When Damasus made a more decided bid for supremacy by telling the Bishop of Mauretania that all important questions must be settled by the Bishop of Rome, he was simply referred to the decrees of Nicaea.

Damasus, in 378, asked the Emperors Gratian and Valentinian to order that persons condemned by the Pope and refusing to submit should be tried by judges appointed by the Pope. This power is plainly by the grace of the Emperor, something new, not the privilege of Peter, centuries old.

The Second General Council, at Constantinople, in 381, was called by the Emperor Theodosius alone, and he alone ratified its actions. Meletius of Antioch, excommunicated by Rome, was the president of the Synod. Neither the Pope nor his legates were present. Pope Leo the Great rejected this Council. Forty years later Pope Felix omits Constantinople from the General Councils. Gelasius gives it no recognition; and yet it is reckoned as a true General Council by Popes Vigilius, Pelagius II, and Gregory the Great.

Bishop Gregory Nazianzen said in his concluding speech: "To thee, O Emperor, we owe what has been decided in this holy council. For at thy call we gathered here," etc.

When Theodosius, in 381, chose Nectarius to be Patriarch of Constantinople, the Italians complained about not having been consulted.

6. *Let us proceed patiently elsewhere to find the "Vicar of Christ."*

When the New Testament canon was fixed at Hippo, in 395, none of the Fathers dreamed of going to ask the Roman

Pope, the infallible teacher of the Church, the one man in all the world divinely qualified to decide what is canonical, what not. "What fools these mortals be!"

We read of the theological schools of Alexandria, of North Africa, of Asia Minor; we do not read of any Italian school.

Though Pope Innocent I, 402—417, refused communion with Atticus of Constantinople and Theophilus of Alexandria, the Eastern churches communed with them.

At the celebrated conference at Carthage, in 411, neither the 286 Catholic nor the 279 Donatist bishops have any inkling of the existence of any Pope with supreme authority in matters of doctrine and practice. (Schick, p. 59.)

Though Pope Felix III, 483—492, excommunicated Acaicius of Constantinople, the Eastern churches remained with the Greek and for some thirty years were not in communion with Rome.

"The bishops of Milan do not come to Rome for ordination," says Pope Pelagius, 555, and adds, "This was an ancient custom of theirs." This independence was finally extinguished by Nicholas II, in 1059. (E. G. Man, p. 193.)

The independence of Aquileja was not destroyed till the 11th century. (Schick, p. 68.)

Early in the seventh century the British bishops would have none of Rome's supremacy. (Schick, p. 34.)

At the Synod of Easterfield, in 702, Archbishop Brihtwald headed other bishops in the refusal to accept the Pope's sentence in favor of Wilfrid against Theodore. Wilfrid charged them with having opposed the Pope for twenty-two years. (*Ang. Br.*, p. 141.)

Gregory, who sent Augustine to England, defines the Church as "one flock under one Shepherd," and says: "All we are one in Christ Jesus—Himself being the *one* Shepherd." He does not claim a second shepherd on earth.

The bishops at the Council of Basel say: "The Church of Rome is not universal, but a part of the universal mystical

body of Christ, which is the Church, and so it is a member of Christ's body mystical as it appeareth by St. Gregory."

Justinian, in the fourth century, decreed that all believers in the Trinity were entitled to the name Catholic. (E. G. Man, pp. 104. 228.)

Charles the Great summoned councils and sat in them, examined and appointed bishops, settled by capitularies the smallest points of church discipline and polity. A synod at Frankfort, in 794, condemned the decrees of the Second Council, of Nicaea, which had been approved by Pope Hadrian, and without excluding images from churches, altogether forbade them to be worshiped or even venerated. He pressed Hadrian to declare Constantine VI a heretic for enouncing doctrines to which Hadrian had himself consented. In extant letters he lectures Pope Leo III in a tone of easy superiority, and admonishes him to obey the holy canons. Pope John VIII admitted and applauded the despotic superintendence of matters spiritual which Charles was wont to exercise, and which led some to give him playfully a title that had once been applied to the Pope himself, "Episcopus Episcoporum" (Bishop of bishops). (Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 70, 8th edition.)

Aleuin advised Charlemagne to send a work by Bishop Felix of East Anglia to Pope Leo III, 795—816, to Paulinus of Aquileja, to Theodore of Orleans, and to Richton of Triers. "If they agree in their arguments, that will be evidence of the truth of their conclusions. But if they do not agree, then that ought to stand valid which is most fully in accordance with the testimonies of Holy Scripture and of the ancient Fathers." (*Ang. Br.*, p. 140.) Evidently Aleuin knew nothing of an infallible Pope.

When Gregory IV, 827—844, went to France to excommunicate King Louis, the French bishops threatened him, "If he comes to ban, he shall return banned himself." (Schick, p. 65.)

Pope Formosus, 891—896, who had helped Arnulf of Carinthia to win the imperial crown, had to pay for this treason

after death; his successor had his body dug up, sentenced by a synod, cut off the finger used in blessing, and thrown naked into the Tiber.

On July 16, 1054 the papal legates placed on the main altar of St. Sophia the excommunication of Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople. That worthy promptly returned the compliment by excommunicating his brother at Rome.

Pope Alexander II blessed William the Norman, 1066, in his design to dispose of the offices and revenues of the English Church in order to punish the English clergy for their independence, according to Prof. Freeman. (*Ang. Br.*, p. 156.) When Pope Gregory VII demanded the arrears in Peter-pence and homage for the crown of England, William proudly and defiantly replied, "I do not find that my predecessors professed it to yours." For some time he refused to allow Archbishop Lanfranc and Archbishop Thomas of York to go to Rome to get the pallium, nor would he permit papal letters to be published in England without his express approval. (l. c., p. 158.)

In 1076 a Council at Winchester absolutely refused to comply with the imperious demand of Gregory VII that the clergy abstain from marriage. (l. c., p. 141.)

Greatly irritated by Lanfranc's allegiance to William the Conqueror, Gregory VII wrote an angry letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1081, imperiously summoning him to Rome within a given time under all manner of ecclesiastical threats. Lanfranc took little notice of Hidebrand and quietly went about his business. (l. c., pp. 161—163.)

Anselm of Canterbury refused to submit to Guido, Archbishop of Vienna, the Papal Legate. (l. c., p. 257.)

In order to protect England from papal aggression, King Henry II, on January 25, 1164, called a council and passed the Constitutions of Clarendon. (l. c., p. 215.)

It is said that nineteen Bishops of St. David's, before Henry I, 1100—1135, and no Irish Bishops before 1151, applied to Rome for a pall. (l. c., pp. 131. 150.)

During the absence of about ten years of Richard I,

1189—1199, the Pope had his way in England, and the result was so disastrous that on his return the King remorsefully cried out, "How shall we answer for these things at the Great Day of Account?" He appointed secular Canons who "will enable us to resist the thieves of Rome." (l. c., p. 219.)

In 1215 the Barons forced King John Lackland to sign Magna Charta and braved the excommunication of the mighty Pope Innocent III.

In 1231 Sir Robert Twenge, a Yorkshire knight, organized a secret society to oppose papal usurpations and extortions.

In 1244 the Barons ordered the Papal Nuncio to leave England at the risk of his life, because of the Pope's execrable extortions, and King Henry III. was unable to give him a safe-conduct.

In 1240 the clergy of Berkshire published that other Churches are not liable to pay tax or tribute to Rome; that Christ gave no power to the Pope to exact large sums of money in the execution of spiritual offices; that the Pope, when he first asked for a contribution, promised not to repeat the request, and that if a second contribution were made to him, as he desired, there was danger of its being drawn into an annual and slavish precedent. (l. c., p. 141.)

In 1253 Boniface of Canterbury burned the papal bull which forbade him to interfere with the monastery of St. Augustine in his own city.

In 1256 Sewal de Boville became Archbishop of York and told Pope Alexander IV that St. Peter was to feed our Lord's sheep, not to flay and eat them. (l. c., p. 258.)

The Parliament at Lincoln, in January, 1301, sent a unanimously signed remonstrance to Boniface VIII, repudiating his jurisdiction "in any temporal matter whatsoever." (l. c., p. 254.)

In 1307 the Parliament of Carlisle passed the first Anti-Papal Statute, limiting the exactions of the Papal Procurator. (l. c., p. 244.)

From the beginning of the reign of Edward III, 1327,

to the end of Richard II, there was much anti-papal legislation, which culminated in the famous Statute of Praemunire, 1392, which denied the Pope's jurisdiction over the English Church. (l. c., p. 269.) Under Henry IV and Henry V the same war on the Pope went on. (l. c., pp. 270—280.)

In 1414 the University of Oxford protested against the simony of John XXIII. (l. c., p. 281.)

Before any rupture with Rome, and according to existing laws, Henry VIII deposed Cardinal Wolsey, and for violating Praemunire the clergy were fined some \$5,000,000. While still in communion with Rome, England abolished the Papal Supremacy and affirmed the Royal Supremacy, in 1534. (l. c., pp. 284—288.)

"For the first thousand years of church history not a question of doctrine was, finally decided by the Pope. The Roman Bishops *took no part* in the commotions which the numerous Gnostic sects, the Montanists and the Chiliasts, produced in the early Church; nor can a single dogmatic decree, issued by one of them, be found during the first four centuries, nor a trace of the existence of any." (Janus, pp. 64. 65.)

"That very late invention, that Bishops receive their jurisdiction from the Pope, and are, as it were, his vicars, ought to be banished from Christian schools, as unheard for twelve centuries," writes "the Eagle of Meaux," the Roman Catholic Bossuet. (*Defens. Decl. Cleri Gall.* VIII, p. 14. Littledale, p. 241.)

It is not till the twelfth century that the decrees of any synod are issued in the name of the president only, even if Pope, but in the name of all the Bishops present, as exercising collective and co-equal authority, as is stated by the Catholic Van Espen. No act or canon of any synod whatever bestows direct authority on the Roman Pope till that of the Lateran in 1215. (Littledale, *P. R.*, p. 238.)

No charge of heresy can be found to have been brought against any one in the ancient Church for denying or resisting the Pope's authority. On the other hand, some of those who

resisted it most steadily are amongst the most famous saints, as St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, and St. Hilary of Arles. (l. c., p. 239.)

Titles of great honor were bestowed upon St. Peter, but so were they upon others of the Apostles; so that does not prove Peter's supremacy. Moreover, the titles of greatest honor were given to Peter by the Eastern Church, which never admitted any supremacy on the part of the Popes of Rome. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 90.)

The Greek Fathers at the Council at Florence very properly said that inferences must not be drawn from titles of honor. (Schick, p. 29.)

No reference to papal authority can be found in any creed, or in any gloss on any creed, till the Creed of Pope Pius IV in 1564. (Littledale, p. 239.)

At his ordination every Roman priest swears to this creed, where you find these words concerning the Scriptures: "Neither will I take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." But there is no unanimous consent of all the Fathers in favor of Peter being the "rock."

According to the VII Epistle of the Roman Catholic Lounoi, in 1731, seventeen Fathers say so; but forty-four say it is the *faith* Peter confessed; sixteen say it is *Christ Himself*; eight say it is *all* the Apostles. (Littledale, *P. C.*, 73—80; Salmon, *Inf.*, p. 335.)

Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis, at the Vatican Council in 1870, in a speech to be delivered, but not delivered, yet printed at Naples, shows the same and goes on: "If we are bound to follow the majority of the Fathers in this thing, then we are bound to hold for certain that by the 'rock' should be understood the faith professed by Peter, not Peter who professed the faith."—"The primacy of the Roman pontiff, both in honor and jurisdiction, I acknowledge, primacy, I say, not lordship." He accepted the primacy as based on tradition. "But that it can be proved from the words of Holy Scripture

I deny. It is true, I held the opposite view when writing the *Observations*, but on closer study of the subject, I judge this interpretation must be abandoned." (Grafton, *Corr.*, p. 74; *Our Brief*, pp. 17—19; McKim, p. 46.)

The first father whom Allnatt in his *Cathedra Petri* can quote for this claim is Pope Siricius, in 386. None of the Greek Fathers of the first six centuries connects the position of the Bishop of Rome with the promise to St. Peter. (Gore, *R. C. C.*, p. 91.)

Janus writes (p. 91): "Of all the Fathers who have exegetically explained these passages in the Gospels (Matt. 16, 18; John 21, 17) *not a single one applies them to the Roman Bishops as Peter's successors*. How many Fathers have busied themselves with these texts, yet not one of them whose commentaries we possess — Origen, Chrysostom, Hilary, Augustine, Cyril, Theodoret, and those whose interpretations are collected in catenas — has dropped the faintest hint that the primacy of Rome is the consequence of the commission and promise to Peter! Not one of them has explained the rock or foundation on which Christ would build His Church of the office given to Peter to be transmitted to his successors, but they understood by it either Christ Himself, or Peter's confession of faith in Christ; often both together. Or else they thought Peter was the foundation equally with all the other Apostles, the Twelve being together the foundation-stones of the Church (Rev. 21, 14)." — Page 92 he writes: "Every one knows that the one classical passage of Scripture on which the edifice of Papal Infallibility has been reared is the saying of Christ to Peter: 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, confirm [strengthen] thy brethren.' But these words manifestly refer only to Peter personally, to his denial of Christ and his conversion. . . . It is directly against the sense of the passage, which speaks simply of faith. . . . to find in it a promise of future infallibility to a succession of Popes, just because they hold the office Peter first held in the Roman church. No single writer to the end of

the seventh century dreamt of such an interpretation; all without exception—and there are eighteen of them—explain it simply as a prayer of Christ that His Apostle might not wholly succumb, and lose his faith entirely in his approaching trial. The first to find in it a promise of privilege to the Church of Rome was Pope Agatho in 680, when trying to avert the threatened condemnation of his predecessor, Honorius, through whom the Roman church had lost its boasted privilege of doctrinal purity.”

“The flower of Roman Catholic learning,” as Ambassador James Bryce calls Doellinger, writes: “For thirteen centuries an incomprehensible silence on this fundamental article reigned throughout the whole Church and her literature. None of the ancient confessions of faith, no catechism, none of the patristic writings composed for the instruction of the people, contain a syllable about the Pope, still less any hint that all certainty of faith and doctrine depends on him.” (Janus, p. 64.) Even Cardinal Hergenroether in his *Irrthuemer*, p. 4, calls Doellinger an “ornament and pillar of the Catholic Church of Germany.”

Bishop Strossmeyer said at the Vatican Council, “If Simon, Son of Jona, was what we believe His Holiness, Pius IX, to be to-day, it is wonderful He had not said to him, ‘When I have ascended to my Father, you shall obey Simon Peter as you obey me. I establish him my vicar on earth’—certainly if He had wished that it would be so, He would have said it. What do you conclude from His silence? Logic tells us that Christ did not wish to make St. Peter head of the apostolic company. Permit me to repeat it! If He had wished to constitute Peter His vicar, He would have given him chief command of His spiritual army. The Apostle Paul makes no mention in any of his letters directed to the various churches of the Primacy of Peter. If this primacy had existed, he would have written a long letter on this all-important subject. Neither in the writings of St. Paul, St. John, or St. James have I found a trace or germ of the papal power. I have sought for

a pope in the first four centuries and I have not found him.” (*Bible Student and Teacher*, Febr., 1908.)

“I conclude victoriously, with History, with Reason, with Logic, with Good Sense, and with a Christian Conscience, that Jesus Christ did not confer any supremacy on St. Peter, and that the Bishops of Rome did not become Sovereigns of the Church, but only by confiscating, one by one, all the rights of the Episcopate.” (McKim, p. 47.)

IV.

Suppose Peter had been the lord of the Apostles and of the whole Church and had desired to give his lordship to his successor, have we any evidence of its regular transmission through a legitimate succession? Did the “mystic oil” come through the “golden pipes” of the two hundred and sixty odd popes down these two thousand years from Peter to Pius X?

1. *A doubtful Pope no Pope.*

a. Cabassute, the papal historian of the Councils, says, “It is very doubtful as to whether Linus, Cletus, or Clement succeeded Peter.”

Very good; Cardinal Bellarmine says, “A doubtful Pope is no Pope.” (*De Conc.* II, ch. 19, sect. XIX.)

The *Liber Pontificalis*, supposed to have been written by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, purports to give the lives of the Popes from Peter to Nicholas I; but Ciampini, in a critical essay in 1688, rejects all but five of the lives as not being written by Anastasius at all, but by several unknown authors, of whose worth we have no means of judging; and from the work of Marini on the Vatican archives it appears that no light can be gotten on this important subject. (Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 304—306.)

Duchesne, who held the Chair of Church History at the Paris School of Theology (1878—1895), had at once the learning of Neander and the irony of Voltaire. His *Etude sur le Liber Pontificalis* (1877), saved with difficulty from the *Index*, demonstrated the presence of fable in the records of the earliest period of the Christian community at Rome. He

refrained from drawing the theological conclusions indicated by his historical criticism. But these could not fail to suggest themselves to his pupils. (Alfred Fawkes in *Hibbert Journal*, Oct., 1909.)

b. Gratian cites a decree by Pope Nicholas II: "If any one be enthroned in the Apostolic See without accordant and canonical election by the Cardinals of the said Church, and thereafter by the religious clergy of lower grade, let him be accounted not Pope or Apostolic, but Apostate."

That is plain and fair. But the Count of Tusculum forcibly imposed Pope Benedict X without any election by the Roman clergy or people. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 309.)

On the death of Honorius II, in 1130, sixteen Cardinals concealed the fact and secretly elected Cardinal Gregory Guidone as Innocent II. The other thirty-two Cardinals then elected Cardinal Peter Leonis as Anacletus II, and both were consecrated the same day. St. Bernard got Emperor Lothar II to put Innocent into possession with the force of the army. This is another defect in the Pope's title.

On the death of Hadrian IV, in 1159, Alexander III had fourteen votes, Victor IV nine, yet the Council of Pavia, in 1160, decided in favor of Victor, probably because he recognized the Council and Alexander refused to do so. From Novatian, in 251, till Nicholas V, in 1328, there were thirty-nine anti-popes.

c. Again, the Canon Law says: "By violent entry upon possession of a benefice every one loses, through that very act, the right he has thereto, and it becomes legally vacant."

Very good. In 366 Pope Damasus went to the Papal chair through violent rioting and shedding of blood, and thereby certainly forfeited his right, which had been very uncertain before.

d. Pope Benedict XIV says, "No one who is not Bishop of Rome can be styled Successor of Peter," and the Councils from Nicaea I to Trent and the Bull of Pius IV, *In Suprema Ecclesiae Specula*, compel every Bishop to a personal residence

in his see, under pain of deprivation. During the seventy years of the "Babylonian Captivity" at Avignon, from 1309—1379, the See of Rome was thereby void.

e. On the death of Pope Gregory XI, in 1378, at Rome, the Cardinals, surrounded by a violent mob, threatening to tear them in pieces and set the house on fire over their heads if they elected a foreign pope, chose an Italian, Urban VI, and notified his election, as usual, to the courts of Europe. When Urban VI began to reform abuses, the French Cardinals set up the plea of constraint and said the Pope, "forgetful of his salvation, and burning with ambition, had allowed himself to be enthroned and crowned; and assumed the name of Pope, though he rather merited that of apostate and Antichrist." They set up Clement VII.

During the Great Schism, from 1378 till 1417, there were two, sometimes three, lines of rival Popes, every one of them cursing every one else as the Antichrist. Who was the true Pope at any given time? St. Catherine of Siena held to the Italian succession; St. Vincent Ferrer to the competing line; St. Antoninus of Florence said the question cannot be settled now; Cardinal Bellarmine says, "A doubtful Pope is no Pope"! (Littledale, *P. R.*, p. 194.)

For a whole generation no man knew whether the Papacy was in Italy or in France. (Lord Acton, *Lect. Mod. Hist.*, p. 91.)

The Jesuit Maimbourg says that even a general council, which had the aid of the Holy Ghost, did not venture to decide which of the Popes was the true one, deposed them all, and set up a new one of its own. (Salmon, *Inf.*, p. 396.)

The Council of Pisa deposed both Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, and elected Alexander V in their place.

Pisa is rejected by the Ultramontanes as irregular. But the title of John XXIII rests on Pisa, and he called the Council of Constance, so that, too, then, is irregular. And that means in law that there was no true Pope after the death of Gregory XI in 1378, and therefore no validly ordained bishops and priests, and no true sacraments!

The Council of Constance deposed and imprisoned Pope John XXIII, disestablished Popes Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, thus rejecting both lines of Popes, and elected Otto Colonna as Pope Martin V. But only one living Cardinal had been created before the death of Gregory XI, and he was that very Peter de Luna who claimed to be Benedict XIII, and refused to acknowledge the right of the Council to question his title, inasmuch as the submission of his two rivals, Gregory XII and John XXIII, left him the only possible valid Pope.

Thus all the votes cast for Martin V by the twenty-three titular Cardinals and the thirty electors chosen by the Council were void. The Pope could not be elected by Cardinals who had no right to vote; if the Pope was elected by the conciliar electors, then they created a wholly new papacy, tracing its origin not to St. Peter, but to the Council of Constance.

A Catholic historian says it belongs to the mysteries of the Curia that it neither recognizes nor overthrows the resolutions of Constance as to the supremacy of the general council over the Pope. It does not recognize it, for it sets up a power superior to the Papacy. It does not overthrow it, for by virtue of this resolution Martin V was elected at Constance. Upon the legitimacy of this election, and of the cardinals named by this Pope, rests the legitimacy of the whole papal elective dynasty since that date. (Hase I, p. 269.)

The Pope's secretary Coluccio Salutato thought that as all church jurisdiction is derived from the Pope, and as a Pope invalidly elected cannot give what he does not himself possess, no bishops or priests ordained since the death of Gregory XI could guarantee the validity of the sacraments they administered. It followed, according to him, that any one who adored the Eucharist consecrated by a priest ordained in schism worshiped an idol. To Jodocus, Margrave of Brandenburg, in 1398. (Janus, p. 295; Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 335.)

2. A heretical Pope no Pope.

Pope Innocent III admitted, "I can be judged by the Church for that sin only which is committed against the Faith."

(Serm. 2 *De Consecrat. Pontif.*) F. Ryder (*Contemp. Review*, Febr., 1879, p. 471) says that the Pope, by manifest heresy, *ipso facto*, ceases to be Pope. St. Raymond de Penaforte says, "Every heretic, secret or manifest, incurs deposition, be he Pope or Emperor." Pope Paul IV in his formidable Bull *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, of 1559, says, that if at any time whatsoever it appear that even the Roman Pontiff, before his promotion to be Cardinal or Pope, have erred from the Catholic faith, his election and all his acts are at once null and void. This Bull is *ex cathedra*, binding on the Church.

a. Pope Liberius, in 357, signed an Arian creed and condemned Athanasius, and for this St. Hilary of Poitiers exclaims, "I say Anathema to thee, renegade Liberius!"

b. Pope Honorius taught the heresy of monothelism in his *ex cathedra* letters, and these were condemned as "most impious" by Pope Martin I in the First Lateran Council, in 649, and it was as "dogmatic epistles" that they were condemned by the Sixth General Council, and ordered to be burned as profane and hurtful to souls—the first example in church history of this kind of sentence. Pope Leo II condemned Honorius anew in a letter to Emperor Const. Pogonatus; damned him eternally in a letter to the Spaniard Bishops, and in a letter to Erwiga, King of Spain.

Pope Gregory II is believed to have drafted the profession of faith in the *Liber Diurnus* in which for many centuries every Pope condemned Honorius to perpetual anathema for the heresy of monothelism.

c. The *Capitale* of Rome, February 18, 1876, brings proof that Pope Pius IX was admitted in his youth as a Freemason and thereby incurred the penalty of excommunication and the anathemas of Clement XII and Benedict XIV.

According to Roman principles, then, there is no warrant for a valid election at any time, no certainty that the wearer of the tiara is Pope at all. (Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 312—315; *P. R.*, pp. 245. 246.)

d. Emperor Ludwig the Pious, in 826, appointed the most

learned clergy of France to make a formal inquiry into the whole question of image-worship, and they formally censured the letter of Pope Hadrian I to Constantine VI and Irene in behalf of image-worship, also the letters of Pope Gregory II, and called it a "pestilent superstition." (Littledale, *P. C.*, pp. 321—324.)

e. Bishop Formosus of Portus was excommunicated by two synods under Pope John VIII and compelled to swear never to return to Rome. The next Pope, Marinus, restored him to his see. Later, Formosus was elected Pope and forced from the altar the previously elected Sergius, and held the chair for five years. After the fifteen days of Pope Boniface VII, Pope Stephen VI dug up the corpse of Formosus, dressed it in the pontifical robes, and put it on trial before a synod for the crime of usurping the Popedom. The corpse was condemned, stripped of its robes, three fingers cut off from the hand, flung into the Tiber, and all ordinations declared null and void. Pope Stephen VI was soon after strangled in prison, and his successor, Pope Romanus, annulled all the acts of Stephen, so did Pope Theodore II, and buried the body of Formosus in the Vatican. Pope John IX had a synod formally annul the acts of the synod under Stephen VI, and ordered them to be burned, and all partakers therein had to plead for pardon.

Now, then, Who's who and what's what in Rome about this time?

3. *An unlawful Pope no Pope.*

Pope Leo V, a few weeks after his enthronement in 903, was thrown into prison by a priest, Christopher, who forced himself into the Papacy. He was, in turn, overthrown by Sergius III, who forced himself into the papal chair; his character is painted in the blackest colors by the historians of the time. Under his auspices the infamous triad of courtesans, the two Theodoras and Marozia, obtained the influence which enabled them to dispose the papal crown several times, to Anastasius III, Laudo, John X, Leo VI, Stephen VII,

John XI, Leo VII, Stephen VIII, Martin III, Agapetus II, and John XII, a mere boy, deposed for atrocious crimes by a synod under Otto I in 963.

The Roman Catholic historian Baronius says (*Ann.* 912, VIII): "What was, then, the aspect of the holy Roman Church? How utterly foul, when harlots, at once most powerful and most vile, bore rule at Rome; at whose will sees were exchanged, bishops appointed, and what is awful and horrible to hear, their paramours were intruded as pseudo-Popes into the See of Peter, who are not set down in the catalogue of the Roman pontiffs, except for the purpose of fixing the dates. For who could assert that persons lawlessly intruded by such courtesans were legitimate pontiffs? There is no mention anywhere of the clergy electing or subsequently assenting. All the canons were thrust down into silence, the decrees of Popes were strangled, the old traditions were banned, the ancient customs, the sacred rites, and the early usages in the election of the Supreme Pontiff were completely annulled. And what sort of cardinals, deacons, and priests do you suppose were chosen by these monsters?" (*Annal. Eccles. An.* 912, tom. X, p. 697, Antv. 1603; quoted in *Pope Joan*, p. 31.)

Gilbert Genebrard, Archbishop of Aix (1537—1597), in his *Chronologia Sacra*, alleges that fifty Popes in 150 years—that is nearly one-fifth of the total number—were apostates rather than apostolic.

Now, then, holiness is one of the five Notes of the Church; the Pope is really the whole Church, the soul and life of the Church; if the Popes are so often and so enormously wicked, what is the result?

If any Petrine succession or privilege ever existed in the Roman church, it was extinguished irrecoverably at the close of this period, extending over sixty years, during which there was not one lawfully elected Pope. Many of them sold dignities, none could lawfully appoint to any office. After sixty years' anarchy no one qualified to elect a Pope was left; therefore the election, in 963, of Leo VIII or of Benedict V (which-

ever be held the true Pope) was void. The Petrine line, if ever a reality, died out in the tenth century.

4. *A simoniactal Pope no Pope.*

In the bull *Cum tum divino*, of Pope Julius II (1503 to 1513), it is said: "Whosoever procures the suffrage of any Cardinal by promises, obligations, or contract made by himself or another, though his election be made by the unanimous vote of the whole College of Cardinals, and even confirmed by adoration, it is nevertheless void and of no effect, and the person so tainted with simoniactal heresy is to be accounted no Pope or Bishop of Rome, but an apostate and arch-heretic." (B. Willard-Archer, p. 40.)

Gammarus, Auditor of the Rota, in his commentary on this bull, alleges it to be so worded as to be retrospective in effect, fully voiding all such former elections. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 311.)

From Jerome's epistles we know that greed of money was a crying sin of the Roman clergy even in his day, so that it had to be dealt with by the civil authorities. Soon simony became habitual and the Roman Senate decreed: "If anything have been given or promised either by the individual himself or by an intermediary for the purpose of obtaining the bishopric, the contract shall be void, and whatever may have been so given shall be restored." (B. Willard-Archer, p. 39.)

Boniface II became Pope through bribery; on his death, in 532, John II became Pope through bribery. King Athalaric wrote, on the authority of the Advocate of the Roman Church, that not only were the poor funds used for this purpose, but even the sacred altar vessels were knocked down to the highest bidder to procure funds for bribery. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 289.)

In the eleventh century Benedict VIII, John XIX, Benedict IX, and Gregory VI gained the Papacy by bribery. Gregory VI was opposed by Benedict and two other anti-Popes and was deposed for simony by the Council of Sutri in 1046. Thus another canonical vacancy of thirty-four years in the Papacy was caused. Without the former gap of sixty years, this

would be enough to cast the gravest doubt on the status of the Roman electorate which elected Clement II in 1046, for only a very few could have been appointed before the simoniacal intrusion of Benedict VIII in 1012. And according to Bishop Bonizo of Sutri, thirty years later, the Germans charged the local Roman clergy with being, almost to a man, either illiterate, simoniac, or immoral. The second count of the indictment is amply borne out by the vain attempts to check the crime of simony at the Synod of Rome in 1047, and by the indignant language of the Abbot of Monte Cassino, later Pope Victor III.

That the Bishop of Rome had no universal jurisdiction is very clear from the simple fact that for the first thousand years his election was a purely local affair.

In order to avoid the rioting and bribery which had so often disgraced the election of a Pope, Nicholas II, in 1059, transferred the election of the Pope from the Roman clergy and people to the College of Cardinals. In 1179, Alexander III made an election by two-thirds of the Cardinals valid. It was not till the election of Lucius III, in 1181, that the new regulation was carried out.

Cardinal della Rovere, nephew of a former Pope, himself Pope Julius II later on, armed with the secrets of the Conclave, insisted that Alexander VI be deposed for having bought the papacy with money and money's worth. (Acton, *Lect. Mod. Hist.*, p. 38.)

There had been no hypocrisy in the transaction; and all Europe was able to learn the exact sums that had been paid, or promised, to his supporters, and even to their attendants. (Acton, *Hist. Essays*, p. 67.)

Pope Julius II tried to free the Church from the responsibility of the acts of Pope Alexander VI; and Luther assailed the system completed by Alexander VI. (l. c., p. 67.)

One of the Popes wrote that he had been raised to the papal throne in place of three others deposed for bribery. (l. c., p. 438.)

Pope Innocent VIII was elected by simony in 1484, and his successor, the infamous Cardinal Roderic de Borgia, was elected in 1492 by a majority of twenty-two out of the twenty-seven Cardinals, whose votes had been bought by Cardinal Ascanio Sforza, as recorded by Von Eggs, the Roman Catholic historian. As Pope Alexander VI, Borgia openly sold the cardinalate to the highest bidders, so that his own popedom and their cardinalate were all void by reason of simony. Pope Julius II was elected in 1503 in a conclave of thirty-seven Cardinals, of whom twenty-six were of Alexander VI's invalid creation, while the same Cardinal Sforza managed the election with the same bribery as the previous one. Pope Leo X was elected, in 1513, by Cardinals, none of whom were competent to elect, since all of them were created either by Alexander VI or Julius II. Pope Leo X sold the cardinalate to the highest bidders, as Alexander VI had done. Pope Clement VII was elected by bribery in 1523. So no conceivably valid election of a Pope has taken place since that of Sixtus IV in 1471, even if every defect before that be condoned.

5. *A lack-of-"intention" Pope no Pope.*

Suppose we grant, for the sake of argument, that Peter was the Prince; that he gave his supremacy to his successor; that there was no break in the succession all these two thousand years; that there was no heresy in any of the popes; that there was no bribery in the election of any single one: what then? Would the Pope's claim to be the Vicar of Christ then be well grounded?

By no means! Listen to the Council of Trent: "If any one shall say that in ministers, while they form and give the sacraments, *intention* is not required, at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema." (Sess. VII, can. 11.)

This was strongly opposed by the Bishop of Minori: "The Bishop thought they ought to consider what grief of mind it would occasion a father of tender feeling towards a dying son, if it occurred to him to doubt the intention of the priest who was baptizing his child," setting forth also the effect of a

baptism without intention as invalidating the confirmation, communion, and ordination of the child if it should become a man, a priest, and a bishop, with all rites which such a bishop might perform. (Dearden, p. 300.)

Some tried to relieve this terrible teaching by saying the intention to perform the outward ceremony is enough; but Alexander VIII, in 1680, condemned this relief opinion. When it was urged that it is against God's justice that a penitent sinner should "be damned through the malice of a priest," Ferraris can merely say, "that they are damned for their sin, actual or original; God has duly provided the means for their salvation, and is not bound, even if He could, to prevent the malice of His ministers." And Addis' Catholic Dictionary says, "It is quite true that the majority of school theologians believe that secret withholding of the intention is enough to invalidate the sacrament." A Romish priest in *Historical Papers*, p. 5, says the persecution of the Spanish Inquisition produced "a class of Jews who were such at heart, although by open profession they had become Christians. . . . Not a few of these secret Jews had risen to high ecclesiastical dignities, some even to bishoprics."

What follows from this?

Cardinal Bellarmine says, "No one can be certain, with the certainty of faith, that he receives a true sacrament, because the sacrament cannot be valid without the intention of the minister, *and no man can see another's intention.*" (Littledale, p. 22.)

What follows from this? For lack of intention on the part of a baptizing priest the boy is never baptized; the boy, when grown, enters the Church, but he never becomes a priest, and every priestly act of his is null and void; those he ordains are no more priests than himself; all their acts are not valid; he becomes Pope, but lacks the infallibility, and so the Church loses her head and becomes a corpse. On his own principles no Romanist can say with certainty that there is a true catholic and apostolic Church on the earth to-day.

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.